



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/825,652	04/16/2004	Johannes Bechtold	07781.0167	8478
22852	7590	10/03/2008	EXAMINER	
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			VU, THANH T	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	2175
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	10/03/2008 PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/825,652	BECHTOLD ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	THANH T. VU	2175	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 June 2008.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

**DETAILED ACTION**

This communication is responsive to Amendment, filed 06/17/2008.

Claims 1-36 are pending in this application.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hughes (U.S. Pat. No. 6,275,223), Chang et al. (“Chang”, U.S. Pat. No. 6,584,479), and Celebiler (U.S. Pat. No. 6,195,094).

Per claim 1, Hughes teaches a computer-implemented method for providing a user-interface, the method comprising:

providing an application for displaying data and for receiving and interrogating user input within a pattern based user interface (figs. 7, 15 and 17; *which show menu tool bar 701 follow a pattern because the menu tool bar 701 is positioned in the same area. In addition, the system receive user inputs in response to user's selections of the items on the menu tool bar, see col. 10, lines 37-45*) and

providing within the application a non-pattern based user interface, in response to interrogating the received user input at least for displaying data, (figs. 7, and 17; *which show the source code display area 702, 703 and 1701 have different patterns (e.g. a pair of source codes or a single source code is displayed. In addition, the source codes are displayed in response to user's selections of the items on the menu tool bar, see col. 10, lines 37-45).*

Hughes does not specifically teach receiving, in the non-pattern based user interface, an input from a user to change a position of at least one element of the data displayed in the non-pattern based user interface, wherein the pattern based user interface and the non-pattern based interface are displayed in frames in a side-by-side relationship. However, Chang teaches receiving, in the non-pattern based user interface, an input from a user to change a position of at least one element of the data displayed in the non-pattern based user interface (col. 11, lines 18-32; *resizing and repositioning of text to accommodate supporting annotations.*) Celebiler teaches displaying of user interfaces in frames in a side-by-side relationship (figs. 3 and 4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the teaching of Chang and Celebiler in the invention of hughes in order to provide the user with dynamic display of supplementary textual or graphical annotations over primary source page, and in order to provide an intuitive and easily manipulated splitter bar

system that allows a user to open, close, and resize a pane in a multi-pane application (Celebiler, col. 1, lines 60-64).

Per claim 2, the modified Hughes teaches the computer-implemented method of claim 1, further comprising displaying business object data of at least two business objects within the non-pattern based user interface (Hughes, figs. 15; *source code object “Demonstration.c.1.1” and “Demonstration.c.1.2”*; col. 11, lines 55-67).

Per claim 3, the modified Hughes teaches the computer-implemented method of claim 1, further comprising displaying business object data of at least two business objects on a side-by-side basis within the non-pattern based user interface (Hughes, fig. 15; *side by side display of areas 1501, and 1502*; col. 12, lines 23-27).

Per claim 4, the modified Hughes teaches the computer-implemented method of claim 1, further comprising providing the non-pattern based user interface within at least one frame separated from the pattern based user interface (Hughes, fig. 5; col. 12, lines 23-27; *areas 1501 and 1502 are at least one frame separated from the toolbar area*).

Per claim 5, the modified Hughes teaches the computer-implemented method of claim 1, further comprising providing general information of business objects within the pattern based user interface and providing detail information of the business objects within the non-pattern based user interface (Hughes, figs. 7 and 8; col. 10, lines 38-58; col. 11, lines 55-67; *detail information is displayed in area 1501 and 1502 of fig. 15*).

Per claim 6, the modified Hughes teaches the computer-implemented method of claim 1, further comprising providing markup-language style sheets within the non-pattern based user interface (Hughes, fig. 22; col. 10, lines 1-12, and lines 17-22).

Per claim 7, the modified Hughes teaches the computer-implemented method of claim 1, further comprising providing the pattern based user interface for all windows within an application (Hughes, figs. 7-10, 15, and 17; toolbar area).

Per claim 8, the modified Hughes teaches the computer-implemented method of claim 1, wherein the pattern based user interface is defined within the application on different hierarchy levels (Hughes, figs. 7 and 8; *toolbar area 701; first level “file menu”, and second level drop down menu display 800*).

Per claim 9, the modified Hughes teaches the computer-implemented method of claim 1, further comprising defining combinations of user interface components within the pattern based user interface (Hughes, fig. 7; col. 9, lines 5-17; *combination of user interface components are defined during software development of the application*).

Per claim 10, the modified Hughes teaches the computer-implemented method of claim 9, further comprising defining the relative and/or absolute position of user interface components within the pattern based user interface (Hughes, col. 9, lines 5-17; *relative and/or absolute position are defined during software development of the application*)

Per claim 11, the modified Hughes teaches the computer-implemented method of claim 1, further comprising providing at least one of text, file directories, graphics, and multimedia content within the non-pattern based user interface (Hughes, fig. 15; *area 1501, and 1502*).

Per claim 12, the modified Hughes teaches the computer-implemented method of claim 1, further comprising changing the appearance of the non-pattern based user interface based on the displayed data (Hughes, fig. 15; *source code display area 1501 and 1502 are displayed based on user selection, see col. 11, lines 55-65*).

Claims 13-24 are rejected under the same rationale as claims 1-12 respectively.

Claims 25-36 are rejected under the same rationale as claims 1-12 respectively.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicants' arguments in the Amendment have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

Applicant's primary argument is that the prior arts do not teach "providing within the application a non-pattern based user interface at least for displaying data, in response to interrogating the received user input; receiving, in the non-pattern based user interface, an input from a user to change a position of at least one element of the data displayed in the non-pattern based user interface". The examiner does not agree because Hughes teaches providing within the application a non-pattern based user interface, in response to interrogating the received user input at least for displaying data. In Hughes, figs. 7 and 17 show that the source codes display areas 702, 703 and 1701 have different patterns (e.g. a pair of source codes or a single source code is displayed). In addition, the source codes are displayed in response to user's selections of the items on the menu tool bar; see col. 10, lines 37-45. Furthermore, Chang teaches receiving, in the non-pattern based user interface, an input from a user to change a position of at least one element of the data displayed in the non-pattern based user interface. Here, in col. 11, lines 18-32, Chang teaches resizing and repositioning of text to accommodate supporting annotations. Accordingly, the combination of Hughes and Chang teaches the claimed limitations of providing within the application a non-pattern based user interface at least for displaying data, in response to interrogating the received user input; receiving, in the non-pattern based user interface, an

input from a user to change a position of at least one element of the data displayed in the non-pattern based user interface.

***Inquiries***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to THANH T. VU whose telephone number is (571)272-4073. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon- Fri 7:00 AM - 3:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William L. Bashore can be reached on (571) 272-4088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Thanh T. Vu/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2175